

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 37-39 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 39 to further clarify the invention and claim 28 to cure minor informalities. In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claim 40, which is clearly supported through out the specification.

Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner withdrew the previous rejections and reopened prosecution in the above-identified application. Claims 1-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Prior Art Rejections and Statement of Substance of the Interview

Claims 1-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,848,108 to Caron (hereinafter “Caron”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following comments.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interviews on August 15, 2006. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview independent claim 1 was discussed in view of Caron. In particular, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*: “under control of a first client application at the first computer, putting the message into a message queue; and under control of a second client application at the second computer, retrieving the message from the message queue.”

Caron relates to creating and sending messages that use self-descriptive objects as messages over a message queuing network. In Caron, the sender application creates a message and provides it to the sender queue and the messaging system forwards the message to the destination queue, where the message is obtained by the second application when the

applications are located on different machines (col. 2, lines 57 to col. 3, line 4). In other words, in Caron, the first application places the message in a first queue at a machine 1, for example, and the message is transported to the machine 2 and is placed in the second queue where the second application retrieves the message (Fig. 2A; col. 6, lines 8 to 18 and col. 8, line 58 to col. 9, line 50). In Caron, each computer 80 and 90 performs both server and client operations for transferring messages 75 “between their respective message queues” (col. 6, lines 15 to 18).

In short, Caron does not disclose a first client application on the first computer connecting and placing a message into a messaging queue and the second client application at the second computer retrieving the message from the same messaging queue. For at least these exemplary reasons and as discussed during the Interview, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Caron. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 and 39. The Examiner indicated that further search and consideration is required with respect to the above-presented argument.

In addition, dependent claim 3 recites: “a content identifier comprises an item identifier and a server name.” The Examiner contends that Caron discloses these unique features of claim 3 in the discussion beginning at col. 5, line 55 (*see* page 4 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Caron lacks any disclosure or suggestion of the message object containing a server name.

Col. 5, lines 55 to 64 of Caron recite:

MSMQ implements asynchronous communications by enabling applications to send messages to, and receive messages from, other applications. These applications may be running on the same machine or on separate machines connected by a network. MSMQ messages can contain data in any format that is understood by both the sender and the receiver. When an application receives a request

message, it processes the request by reading the contents of the message and acting accordingly. If required, the receiving application can send a response message back to the original requester.

That is, as is visible from the above-quoted passage, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Caron that the message will include a content identifier comprising an item identifier and a server name. In fact, Caron addresses the content of the messages in col. 7, line 60 to col. 8, line 32. However, in Caron, the elements comprise a name, type, and value. In Caron, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a content identifier comprising the server name.

Since Caron only discloses elements that include a name, a type, and a value and fails to disclose a content identifier including an item identifier and a server name, the rejection is improper as it lacks “sufficient specificity” required under 102. “[A]nticipation under § 102 can be found only when the reference discloses exactly what is claimed and that where there are differences between the reference disclosure and the claim, the rejection must be based on § 103 which takes differences into account.” *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); MPEP § 2131. Therefore, for at least these additional exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable from Caron.

Next, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the rest of the claims 10-35, 37, and 38. Of these claims, only claims 10, 19, 28, and 35 are independent. Among a number of unique features not taught by the cited prior art references, claims 10, 19, 28, and 35 contain features that are similar to the features argued above with respect to claim 1, those arguments are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to

withdraw this rejection of the independent claims 10, 19, 28, and 35 and their dependent claims 11-18, 20-27, 29-34, 37, and 38.

In addition, independent claim 28 recites: “when the body of the message comprises no said text and no said content identifier, the message is an event notification notifying the second application of an occurrence of an event.” During the Interview, the Examiner indicated that col. 6, lines 1 to 6 of Caron disclose these unique features of claim 28. Applicant respectfully disagreed indicating that the applications make requests to queues and not to another application. That is, Caron’s disclosure of the applications making requests to the queues are not the messages transmitted being the two applications. In Caron, there is no disclosure or suggestion of an event notification and the message including no text and no content identifier. For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claim 28 is patentably distinguishable from Caron. The Examiner appeared to agree but indicated that further search and consideration is required.

Dependent claim 29 recites: “wherein said content identifier identifies a search result of a search performed by said first application, and wherein said search result comprises at least one object stored in said at least one server computer” and dependent claim 30 recites: “wherein the system is a federated content management system.” As explained above, Caron is unrelated to the federated content management system. There is no suggestion or mention in Caron of a federated content management system and performing searches in these systems. Applicant respectfully submits that Caron does not disclose or suggest the message identifying a search result of a search performed by the first application and the result comprising an object stored in the server computer. Further, Caron does not disclose or suggest the federated content management system. For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claims 29 and 30 are

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and Statement of Substance of Interview
U.S. Appln. No. 09/750,489
Attorney Docket No.: A8118

patentably distinguishable from Caron. The Examiner appeared to agree and indicated that claim 30 may contain allowable subject matter subject to further search and consideration.

New Claim


New claim 40 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 16, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: A8118